

In the present case I very much regret to disagree with T. C. Morrisson-Scott, on the following grounds.

1. *Pan* undoubtedly is a "well stabilized" name for the chimpanzees. In case we accept the correct generic name *Chimpansee* Voigt, 1831, it certainly will be confusing for non-taxonomists to call a gorilla, *Chimpansee*, once they are accepted as co-generic. But it would also be confusing to call scientifically a gorilla, *Pan*, once it is a "well stabilized" name for the chimpanzees. . . . In fact what is confusing and strange—to non-primatologists—is not the nomenclatorial problem, but the discovery that gorillas and chimpanzees are so closely related. If the name *Gorilla* was older than *Pan* or *Chimpansee*, it would also be confusing to call a chimpanzee, *Gorilla*.

2. With the names *Panthera* Oken, 1816, and *Leo* Brehm, 1829 the same problem arises. Lions, jaguars, tigers and leopards (or panthers), all belong to the same genus. But when you use a new combination for the first time, then you realize how closely related these animals are considered to be. To call a panther *Leo* is no more confusing than to call a lion, *Panthera*.

Altogether, there is some argument about the type-species of *Panthera* Oken, which Hershkovitz holds to be the South American *Felis colocolo*, once Allen selected *Panthera vulgaris* Oken as the type-species.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR THE VALIDATION UNDER THE  
PLENARY POWERS OF *TINODES PUSILLUS* McLACHLAN, 1862 (INSECTA,  
TRICHOPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 1592  
(see volume 20, pages 395–396)

By W. E. China (Assistant Secretary  
to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

The proposal contained in this application was submitted to Commissioners for a vote on Voting Paper (65)29, issued on 23 August 1965. Although a two-thirds majority vote for Mr. Kimmins' proposals was obtained, Commissioners Holthuis, Lemche, Ride and Sabrosky returned comments with their Voting Papers pointing out that both *Tinodes pusillus* Curtis, 1834, and *Tinodes pusillus* McLachlan, 1862, have no nomenclatorial status, being merely re-uses of *Phryganea pusilla* Fabricius, 1781. Although in 1834 Curtis queried the synonymy of his *pusilla* with *P. pusilla* Fabricius, 1781, in 1837 (*Guide to the arrangement of British Insects* (ed. 2) : 171) he dropped the question mark. Neither *T. pusillus* Curtis, 1834, nor *T. pusillus* McLachlan, 1862, therefore, poses a threat to *Tinodes assimilis* McLachlan, 1865.

Mr. Kimmins' aim, to conserve the name *Tinodes assimilis* McLachlan, is, consequently, fulfilled without action by the Commission and he has decided to withdraw his application.

The taxon previously known under the names *pusillus* Curtis, 1834, *pusillus* McLachlan, 1862, and *aureolus* auct. nec Zetterstedt, is now without a name. Mr. Kimmins will provide one in the near future in some entomological journal.

Application Z.N.(S.) 1592 is consequently withdrawn.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE  
FOR *BELEMNITES MUCRONATUS* LINK, 1807. Z.N.(S.) 1160  
(see volume 21, pages 268–296; volume 22, pages 138–139, 343–345)

By R. V. Melville and C. J. Wood (Geological Survey and Museum,  
London, England)

1. We wish to support the main arguments of Dr. Jeletzky's application for the designation under the plenary powers of a neotype for the species generally known by the name *Belemnitella mucronata*. One of us (R.V.M.) has already done so in general